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1. Introduction

Word orders in Old English have attracted much attention on both linguistic and philological grounds. Compared with Present-day English, Old English word orders have wider variation, as we can see in the following examples:

(1) þa hie ða dune gesawon
when they the hill saw
'when they saw the hill' (Gen 22.4/Denison (1993: 35))

(2) On twam þingum hæfde God þæs mannæs sawle gegodod
in two things had God the man’s soul endowed
‘God had endowed man’s soul with two things’

(AECHom I 1.20.1/Denison (1993: 42))

(3) þæt he mehte his feorh generian
that he might his life save
‘so that he could save his life’ (Or 48.18/Denison (1993: 51))

* I would like to thank two anonymous EL reviewers for their invaluable suggestions and comments on an earlier version of this paper. Of course, all remaining errors and inadequacies are mine.
In this book, Susan Pintzuk (henceforth, P) attempts to offer a comprehensive explanation for such word order variations in Old English and to account for their subsequent changes. This book is a slightly revised version of P’s 1991 doctoral dissertation. Therefore P’s insightful proposal has been already referred to in several articles and books, such as van Kemenade (1997), Koopman (1996, 1997, 1998), Kato (1997), Ohkado (2001) and Fischer et al. (2001). Though P does not update her previous analysis in her present book, she does revise her discussion on the basis of several works that have been published since the appearance of her dissertation. I will consider some recent discussions of P’s argument in the latter part of this review.

This article is organized as follows. Section 2 describes P’s central observations on the position of the verb and cliticization in Old English and explains her proposal about word order change in Middle English. Section 3 gives careful consideration to P’s double base hypothesis and discusses its advantages and drawbacks in detail. In Section 4, I will refer to a recent development related to P’s assumptions and make some concluding remarks.

2. Explanation of Word Order Variation

2.1. Double Base Hypothesis

At the beginning of her argument, P discusses the standard analysis of Old English clause structure, which has been also generally assumed for other West Germanic languages. According to the standard analysis, all clauses are uniformly INFL-final and OV in the base, with obligatory movement of the highest verb to INFL to receive tense. Therefore, in order to explain variation of word order in Old English, the standard analysis is naturally required to postulate postposition, verb raising and verb projection raising in subordinate clauses as well as in main clauses, as shown in (4), (5) and (6).

(4) þe god t畏 worhte [pp þurh hine]i
which God wrought through him
‘... which God wrought through him ...’

(5) þ min dohtor t畏 ware [v forðfaren]i
that my daughter was died
‘... that my daughter had died.’

\(\text{ÆLS }31.7/\text{p. }48\)

\(\text{ApT }24.27-25.1/\text{p. }45\)
(6) *sona swa his fers $t_i$ wæs [VP æt-foran him geraed]$_i$
    "As soon as his verse was before them read"
    ‘As soon as his verse was read before them …’

(ÆLS 31.280/p. 45)

However, arguing that subordinate clauses in Old English are not uniformly INFL-final in the base, P proposes that variation in the position of the finite verb in subordinate clauses reflects variation in the underlying position of INFL: clause-medial vs. clause-final. This analysis is called the *double base hypothesis*. Under this analysis, as the finite verb can move to the clause-medial INFL, it is not essential to assume postposition, verb raising or verb projection raising as shown in (7), (8) and (9).¹

(7) *pe god [worhte]$_i$ þurh hine $t_i$
    which God wrought through him
    ‘… which God wrought through him …’

(ÆLS 31.7/p. 48)

(8) *þe min dohtor [waere]$_i$ forðfaren $t_i$
    that my daughter was died
    ‘… that my daughter had died.’

(ApT 24.27–25.1/p. 45)

(9) *sona swa his fers [wæs]$_i$ æt-foran him geraed $t_i$
    as-soon-as his verse was before them read
    ‘As soon as his verse was read before them …’

(ÆLS 31.280/p. 45)

P explains that IP’s are either head-initial or head-final, and the highest verb obligatorily moves to INFL to receive tense. All clauses contain a topic position, Spec(IP), which is filled at s-structure by either the subject or a non-subject constituent. D-structures and s-structures of both subordinate clauses with non-subject topics are shown in (10) and (11).

¹ I added a syntactic representation to an original sentence for the sake of convenience if necessary.
(10) INFL-medial phrase structure
   a. d-structure

   CP
       \   /
   \ /  |
  C  IP
     /|
    comp Spec I'

    I
    /|
    VP Spec V'

    Spec
    /
    Subject ... XP ... Vf

   b. s-structure

   CP
       \   /  
   \ /  |
  C  IP
     /|
    comp Spec I'

    XPj I
    /|
    Vfi Spec V'

    Spec
    /
    Subject ... tj ... ti

(11) INFL-final phrase structure:
   a. d-structure

   CP
       \   /  
   \ /  |
  C  IP
     /|
    comp Spec I'

    VP I
    /|
    Spec V'

    Spec
    /
    Subject ... XP ... Vf
Although, under the double base hypothesis, some examples are structurally ambiguous, P demonstrates the existence of Old English subordinate clauses for which an INFL-final analysis is not possible, and which therefore must be analyzed as INFL-medial.

First, on the basis of the study of particles by Hiltunen (1983), P argues that the distribution of particles supports the double base hypothesis. She demonstrates that particles almost never appear after the main verb in clauses with auxiliaries (0.0% and 3.2%) or in verb-final (VF) clauses with finite main verbs (1.4%), but appear frequently in post-verbal position in verb-medial (VM) clauses with finite main verbs.

Table 1
Distribution of particles in Old English subordinate clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>Before Main Verb</th>
<th>After Main Verb</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clauses with auxiliaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VF clauses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM clauses</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses with finite main verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VF clauses</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM clauses</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(p. 56)
verbs (26.9%); see Table 1.

The structure in which a post-verbal particle occurs is almost always limited to VM clauses with finite verbs as in (12).

(12) gif Crist scute δα adun
    if Christ casts then down
    ‘... if Christ then casts himself down ...’

(ÆCHom i. 170.21-22/p. 58)

Under the standard analysis, it must be necessary to assume particle postposition, because a verb must move to INFL-final position and stay there in a subordinate clause. However, claims P, even if we can assume that a particle can be postposed regardless of its heaviness, the frequency of the postposition should be almost the same in all clause types. Yet, contrary to our expectation, post-verbal particles are almost always found in VM clauses with finite main verbs. Under the INFL-medial analysis, the fronting of the verb to INFL can easily account for such bias of frequency, as in (13).

(13) [CP [c' þæt [IP þær [I' eodei [VP fyrd ut ti]]]]]
    that there went fire out
    ‘... that the fire went out there ...’

(GD(C) 123.27/p. 59)

In the above example, the verb moves to INFL-medial, leaving a particle in its base-generated position.

Second, P argues that the distribution of pronominal objects and monosyllabic adverbs also supports the existence of INFL-medial phrase structure in Old English subordinate clauses. She demonstrates that pronominal objects and monosyllabic adverbs appear after the main verb in VM clauses with finite verbs (5.7%), but never in VF clauses with finite main verbs (0.0%). Their distribution is shown in Table 2.

---

2 VF clauses have two or more heavy constituents before the verb cluster and VM clauses have at most one heavy constituent before it. Then both under the standard analysis and the double base hypothesis, VF clauses are INFL-final. But the word order in VM clauses is consistent with either INFL-final or INFL-medial phrase structure under the double base hypothesis.
The standard theory requires us to postulate a rule to postpose pronominal objects and monosyllabic adverbs though they are not heavy elements. But the fronting of the verb to INFL, which can be assumed under the INFL-medial analysis, can give an adequate explanation of such distribution as described above in our discussion of particles.

Third, though P assumes the existence of verb raising in Old English, she insists that its frequency of application is relatively low, on the basis of the small number of unambiguous INFL-final phrases with verb raising, as in (14).

(14) þe æfre on gefeohte his handa ti wolde [afylan],
who ever in battle his hands would defile
‘... who would ever defile his hands in battle …’

(P. 60)

P states that sentences with two or more heavy constituents before the auxiliary verb, like on gefeohte and his handa in (14), are considered to have verb raising because no INFL-medial position is available as a landing site, but the number of these sentences, which have actual or potential verb raising, is quite small, as demonstrated in Table 3.
On the basis of such statistical analysis, P assumes that there is little support for verb raising even in ambiguous examples, and argues that the majority of subordinate clauses with the auxiliary verb in medial position must be derived from INFL-medial phrase structure by verb fronting (15b), rather than from INFL-final by verb raising (15a).

Table 3
Frequency of verb raising in Old English subordinate clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of auxiliary verb/ Number of heavy constituents preceding the verb cluster</th>
<th>Actual or potential verb raising (aux+mv)</th>
<th>No verb raising (mv+aux)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>1 33.3%</td>
<td>2 67.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at most 1</td>
<td>3 16.7%</td>
<td>15 83.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causative/perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at most 1</td>
<td>4 40.0%</td>
<td>6 60.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>4 10.5%</td>
<td>34 89.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at most 1</td>
<td>124 30.3%</td>
<td>285 69.7%</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective ‘have’/‘be’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>1 5.6%</td>
<td>17 94.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at most 1</td>
<td>19 21.1%</td>
<td>71 78.9%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘be’+past part.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>4 16.7%</td>
<td>20 83.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at most 1</td>
<td>55 28.1%</td>
<td>141 71.9%</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘be’+pres. part.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>1 11.1%</td>
<td>8 88.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at most 1</td>
<td>12 29.3%</td>
<td>29 70.7%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>11 11.8%</td>
<td>82 88.2%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at most 1</td>
<td>217 28.4%</td>
<td>547 71.6%</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(p. 70)
The same argument applies to verb projection raising. P finds only two unambiguous cases of INFL-final subordinate clauses affected by verb projection raising in her quantitative database, as shown in (16) and (17).

(16) hwaer ænegu þeod æt ｏþerre t1 mehte [vP frið begietan],
where any people from other might peace obtain
‘... where any people might obtain peace from another ...’
(Or 31.14–15/p. 71)

(17) þæt on þære fæmnena mynstre, on þam wacode eac
that in the maids’ monastery, over which kept-watch also
þæs ilcan fæder ymbehoga, an þara nunnena, seo wæs
the same father’s care, one (of) the nuns, who was
swiðe fæger æfter þæs lichaman gesceape, t1 wearð [vP
very beautiful in the body’s shape was
færlice mid fefore geswenced],
suddenly by fever afflicted
‘... that in the maids’ monastery, over which the same
father’s care also kept watch, one of the nuns, who was very
beautiful in bodily shape, was suddenly afflicted by fever ...’
(GD(H) 28.21–27/p. 72)

Therefore, on the basis of the small number of unambiguous examples, P argues that verb projection raising is probably not a productive process in the grammar of Old English. She concludes that the great majority of structurally ambiguous clauses are derived from INFL-medial phrase structure by verb movement to INFL rather than from INFL-final phrase structure by verb projection raising.

Next, let us examine how the double base hypothesis works to explain the verb-second phenomenon in Old English. According to the standard analysis of the verb-second constraint, which requires the finite verb to be the second constituent of the clause, the position of the finite verb in main clauses is derived by verb movement to COMP.
However, on the basis of the position of clitics appearing before the fronted finite verb in main clauses as in (18), P argues that the verb in these clauses moves to clause-initial INFL rather than to COMP.

(18) a. *he hine* “eft “ongon “wæteres “weorpan
   *he him* again began water sprinkle
   ‘He began to sprinkle him again with water …’
   (Beo 2790–2791/p. 85)

b. 

```
  IP
    Spec
      hej Spec
      hinek Spec
      eftm ongoni
    t_j t_k t_m wæteres weorpan t_i
```

P explains that, based on her close examination of *Beowulf*, unstressed pronouns, such as *he* and *hine* in (18), are not topics, and that they therefore must be clitics which attach to the left periphery of Spec(IP). P limits V-to-COMP movement to either direct questions, imperative clauses or main declarative clauses with the finite verb, either positive or negative,3 in clause-initial position, and then argues that the finite verb generally moves to clause-medial INFL or clause-final INFL.

As for the underlying order of verbs and their complements, P refutes the assumption that the phrase structure is uniformly OV in Old English. Her argument is again supported by the distribution of particles in Old English clauses. If Old English has uniform OV phrase structure, P says, it would be expected that particles in clauses with auxiliary verbs should always appear before the non-finite main verb, reflecting their base-generated position. However, P shows that particles can appear after the main verb, as shown in (19):

3 P assumes a negative particle *ne* to be a clitic, as in (i).

(i) 

```
[C ne maeg] [IP ic her leng wesan]
not can I here longer be
‘I can’t stay here any longer.’
```

(Beo 2801/p. 135)
(19) he wolde _adraefan ut_ anne æþeling
  he would _drive out_ a prince
  ‘... he would drive out a prince ...’
  (ChronB(T) 82.18–19 (755)/p. 104)

In addition, P states that if the post-verbal position of particles in INFL-medial clauses like (19) were derived from OV phrase structure by postposition or particle movement, we would expect particles to appear post-verbally in INFL-final clauses as well. But such examples are not attested in her database. Thus she claims that the hypothesis of uniform OV phrase structure with postposition cannot account for the distribution and is descriptively inadequate.

As we have seen, P provides evidence for the double base hypothesis through the distribution of particles, pronominal objects, and monosyllabic adverbs in subordinate clauses, together with the low frequency of verb projection raising. Moreover, postulating the double base hypothesis enables her to provide a more adequate explanation of V2 phenomena and OV/VO variation in Old English.

2.2. Cliticization

In order to explain the fact that the finite verb often appears in third or fourth position in Old English, which seems to be incompatible with its V2 character, P demonstrates that some pronouns and adverbs in Old English are syntactic clitics, which attach to the left or right periphery of the first immediate constituent of the domain of cliticization.4 In this section, I will explain her account of cliticization in more detail.

First, on the basis of the data from _Beowulf_, P argues that unstressed pronominal subjects behave differently from stressed ones. Thus she assumes that unstressed pronouns are positioned in the IP-initial string, while stressed ones remain in situ; alternatively, they may topicalize or postpose.

(20) a. _he him “foran “ongean “linde “bærøn_
      who _him_ in-front toward shields carried

4 The clitic analysis of pronominals and other elements in Old English was originally proposed by van Kemenade (1987). But in the book under review P strongly rejects van Kemenade’s analysis of cliticization on both conceptual and empirical grounds. For further discussion, see p. 147—p. 156.
‘... who in front carried shields toward him.’

(Beo 2364–2365/p. 132)

b. “God “wat on “me
  God knows about me
  ‘God knows about me . . .’

(Beo 2650/p. 133)

In (20a), unstressed him moves from the base-generated position after the preposition foran, while in (20b) stressed me remains in situ after the preposition on. Extending her argument to adverbs, P proposes that some pronominal subjects, some pronominal objects and some adverbs are syntactic clitics, as shown in (21).

(21) a. IP  
  Spec I'  
  Cl Spec  
  Topic

b. IP  
  Spec I'  
  Spec Cl  
  Topic

P then goes on to clarify some differences between syntactic cliticization in Beowulf and syntactic cliticization in the later texts. First, demonstrative pronouns in Beowulf are clitics, while demonstrative pronouns in the later texts are not. Second, the clitics attach to the left periphery of Spec(IP) in Beowulf, but to the left or right periphery of Spec(IP) in the later texts. Third, the domain of cliticization is IP for all clitics in Beowulf; in the later texts, the domain of cliticization is IP for pronominal subjects, pronominal objects, and adverbs, while pronominal objects of prepositions have three domains of cliticization (IP, VP and PP). Fourth, cliticization is obligatory for all unstressed pronouns and adverbs in Beowulf; in the later texts, cliticization is obligatory only for pronominal subjects, and optional for pronominal objects, pronominal objects of prepositions, and adverbs.

In this way, P’s analysis of cliticization explains the seemingly rather arbitrary distribution of pronouns and adverbs in Old English clauses. It enables her to account for the fact that in Old English, unlike other verb-second languages, the finite verb is not necessarily the second constituent of verb-second clauses.

2.3. Word Order Changes

In her final two chapters (Chapter 5 and 6), P discusses several
aspects of word order change in the history of the English language. First, she takes up the question of change in the underlying position of INFL, demonstrating that, in both main and subordinate clauses, the frequency of the INFL-medial structure gradually increases at the expense of the INFL-final structure during the course of the Old English period, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Frequency of INFL-medial vs. INFL-final phrase structure in Old English main and subordinate clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Subordinate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% INFL medial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>GD(C)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>Chad, Bede</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>ChronA, Scribe 1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>Laws(A)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Or, CP</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>ChronA, Section a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>BHom</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>ChronA, Section b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>ChronA, Scribe 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>ChronA, Scribe 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991</td>
<td>ÆCHom</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995</td>
<td>ÆLS</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>GD(H), ChronA, Scribes 4–5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td>WHom</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Mald</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025</td>
<td>ApT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>ChronA, Scribe 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>ChronA, Scribes 7–9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>ChronE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(p. 208)
By applying a statistical analysis to the above data, P argues that the change in the underlying position of INFL in Old English might well be an example of linguistic change that confirms to the Constant Rate Hypothesis proposed by Kroch (1989). Figure 1 indicates that the frequency of INFL-medial structure in both main and subordinate clauses increases gradually, and at the same rate, during the course of the Old English period.

![Figure 1](image-url)

In her final chapter, P gives a brief sketch of word order changes in Middle English: the loss of INFL-final phrase structure, the loss of OV phrase structure, the loss of V2 and constraints on verb movement to COMP.

First, considering the loss of INFL-final order and OV order, P argues that the postulation of the double base hypothesis automatically enables her to explain the synchronic variation in word order found in both Old English and Middle English. This is because it can easily be assumed under her hypothesis that the frequency of INFL-medial and VO structures slowly increases at the expense of INFL-final and OV structures.

Second, following Santorini (1992), P argues that the loss of verb seconding can be analyzed as a change in the type of AGR, from inherently nominative AGR in Old English to neutral AGR in Modern English. In this argument, it is presumed that AGR must be identified as nominative at S-structure. In languages with inherently nominative AGR, subjects receive nominative case in their underlying position in Spec(VP), and either subjects or non-subjects can move to Spec(IP).
On the other hand, for languages with neutral AGR, a licensing condition on AGR is met only if AGR is c-commanded by a thematic antecedent with nominative case. Therefore the subject must move from Spec(VP) to Spec(IP), as in Modern English.

Lastly, regarding constraints on verb movement to COMP, P argues that movement of the finite verb from INFL to COMP in Old English clauses is triggered by an operator (WH, Adv, Null) in Spec(CP), but in Modern English such movement is restricted to auxiliary verbs in questions, declarative clauses with preposed polarity items and verb-initial subjunctive clauses. She suggests that the operator in Spec(CP) ceased to trigger verb movement to COMP during the course of Middle English, but the reason for the change is not fully explained. P herself admits the lack of empirical evidence for the above assumption, and regards it as a topic for future research.

3. Discussion

3.1. Structural Ambiguity

As we saw in the preceding section, P postulates the double base hypothesis to explain the variation of word orders in Old English. Then she examines the frequency of INFL-medial vs. INFL-final phrase structure in Old English. After her quantitative study, P shows that the frequency of INFL-medial structure slowly increases at the expense of INFL-final structure during the course of the Old English period. In addition, she demonstrates that the frequency of INFL-medial phrase structure increases at the same rate in main clauses as in subordinate clauses during the Old English period, which conforms well with the Constant Rate Hypothesis.

However, due to difficulty in determining the underlying structure of some sentences, P excludes from consideration the following clause types: 1) clauses with finite main verbs, 2) clauses exhibiting verb movement to COMP, and 3) subordinate clauses not introduced by an overt complementizer or subordinating conjunction. This means that a considerable number of sentences in Old English are excluded from her corpus. Furthermore, there still remains some ambiguity inherent in clauses with the auxiliary verb in medial position as in (22) and (23).

(22) for-ðan þe hi sceoldon fyrdrian
    because they must serve-in-the-army
    ‘... because they must serve in the army...’
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a. INFL-medial phrase structure:
   for-pan þe hi [₁ sceoldon₁] fyrdrian t₁
b. INFL-final phrase structure with verb raising:
   for-pan þe hi t₁ sceoldon [v fyrdrian]₁

(ÆLS 28.11/p. 63)

(23) þæt Libertinus mihte ðís gedon
that Libertinus might this do
‘... that Libertinus might do this ...’

a. INFL-medial phrase structure:
   þæt Libertinus [₁ mihte₁] ðís gedon t₁
b. INFL-final phrase structure with verb projection raising:
   þæt Libertinus t₁ mihte [VP ðís gedon]₁

(GD(C) 19.7–8/p. 72)

P argues that the distribution of particles indicates only weak evidence for verb (projection) raising, and that these types of clauses basically have INFL-medial phrase structure with V-to-INFL movement. However, she also concedes that some clauses with the auxiliary verb in medial position can be derived from INFL-final phrase structure. In her words:

I assume that for each text in the database, a small number of the clauses with the auxiliary verb in medial position are derived from INFL-final phrase structure by verb (projection) raising rather than from INFL-medial phrase structure by verb movement to INFL. Thus the database contains instances of verb raising clauses that have been analyzed as INFL-medial clauses, and the reported frequency of INFL-medial structure is slightly higher than the actual frequency for each text. (p. 205)

It is true that such a probabilistic approach is sometimes adopted for dealing with a large corpus. But in the size of this corpus such accidental errors caused by the approach must be avoided. Especially, it seems to invalidate her argument that P ignores some data which contradict her assumptions, even if they are few in number. Taking such data into account might lead to contradictory results. A more cautious approach is required in dealing with historical data, though the problem of ambiguity in diachronic studies is quite hard to solve because of the difficulty in verifying the analysis.

3.2. Optionality

Next I will take up the question of optionality assumed by the double
base hypothesis. Under the hypothesis, two conflicting parameters (INFL-final vs. INFL-medial and OV vs. VO) are assumed for Old English phrase structure. This seems to be incompatible with rigorous structural analysis and may illegitimately complicate the analysis of linguistic phenomena. P does address this argument, quoting a long paragraph from Santorini (1992: 619–621), and claiming that it is wrong to assume that the relationship between particular phenomena and the theoretical principles governing them is necessarily simple. Moreover, she agrees that the changing patterns of linguistic variation in historical data are phenomena of E-language, and that the goal is to deduce from these patterns the principles of the I-language governing them. Then these phenomena themselves can be taken to provide empirical support for the theoretical distinction between E-language and I-language. Thus she concludes that the double base hypothesis is compatible with the spirit of generative inquiry.

However, P’s hypothesis still has some problems. First, her theory predicts that we may assume two conflicting parameters (INFL-medial and OV, INFL-final and VO), which may derive sentences such as (24) and (25).

(24) Subj AUX XP MV
(25) *Subj MV XP AUX

(p. 116)

However, the former structure (24) is allowed but the latter structure (25) is disallowed in Old English. As P herself admits (p. 117), this difference cannot easily be explained in P’s framework.

Another problem is that it is difficult for language learners to induce and then use two alternative sets of well-formedness principles. P explains the possibility by taking the ability of bilingual speakers as an example. However, such an argument ignores the fact that her assumed conflicting parameters exist simultaneously in one particular language. Bilingual speakers can change parameters when they switch from one language to another, but they never use both parameters in the same language.

Optionality is one of the most controversial issues in explaining syntactic change in the history of English. Further research is indispensable for solving the problem.

3.3. The Structure of IP

In her explanation of cliticization, P presumes that a sentence must have a topic which occupies Spec(IP). But certain implications follow
from P’s argument for the existence of topics in the Spec of IP. First, under the standard theory, a topic element moves to Spec(CP) as shown in (26).

(26) \[CP \{py \ ilcan \ geare\} [C' \ drehton\} [IP \{pa \ hergas\} [I' \ t; \ [VP \ t; \ tk \ on the same year \ harried \ the armies \ in East englum \ t;] \ & \ ... \ East Anglia \ and \ ... \ ‘in the same year the armies harried east Anglia and ...’ \]

(Parker 895/van Kemenade (1987: 18))

However, under P’s assumption, a topic element instead occupies Spec(IP) as in (27).

(27) \[IP \{[mid \ py]\} \delta a_k\} [I' \{I \ ongon\} [VP \ firenlust \ t; \ tk \ weaxan \ t;]] \]

‘With that, riotous living then began to increase’

(Bede 48.27/p. 169)

If P’s assumption is correct, we can expect such configurations even in subordinate clauses. In other words, it can be presumed that V2 with topicalization should occur even in a subordinate clause. However, according to Fischer et al. (2001: 115), a moved finite verb in subordinate clauses is never preceded by a topic, except in constructions with bridge verbs as in (28) and in unaccusative constructions as in (29).

(28) pa \ cwæp \ se \ halga \ wer, \ of \ ðam \ heofonlican \ leohte \ ne then \ said \ the \ holy \ man, \ of \ the \ heavenly \ light \ not beo \ ge \ afyrhte. be \ you \ afraid ‘then the holy man said: do not be afraid of the heavenly light.’ \ (ÆLS(Vincent) 196/Fischer et al. (2001: 116))

(29) ðæt \ eallum \ folcum \ sy \ gedemed \ beforan \ ðe that \ all \ peoples \ be \ judged \ before \ thee ‘that all the peoples be judged before you’

(PPs(prose) 9.18/Fischer et al. (2001: 117))

Therefore, P’s argument that Spec(IP) is the general topic position is not convincing.  

---

5 An anonymous reviewer pointed out that topicalization could not be assumed in subordinate clauses from a functional or pragmatic point of view. I agree on little possibility of topicalization in subordinate clauses. But the problem is that P thinks
Second, Spec(IP) can be considered to have become a subject position during the course of Middle English. P needs to explain how and why the status of that position abruptly changed in a relatively short time. The loss of the dative passive construction, the loss of the impersonal construction, and the rise of expletive *there* in Middle English must have some close relation with the change of Spec(IP) status.

Third, in the Government and Binding framework P uses, Spec-Head Agreement within IP plays an important role. But if Spec(IP) is preserved for a topic element, Spec-Head Agreement is not assured. P needs to give a more comprehensive account of the structure of IP.

### 3.4. Cliticization

In many Old English clauses, the finite verb can appear in third or fourth position, as shown in (30):

(30) paet pa Deniscan him ne mehton ðæs ripes
so-that the Danes them not could the harvest
refuse
‘... so that the Danes could not refuse them the harvest.’

For the above example, which looks exceptional for a verb-second language, P assumes the cliticization of pronouns and adverbs to the left or right periphery of Spec(IP), as shown in (31).

(31) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{him}_k \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{mehton}_i \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{Deniscan}_j \\
\end{array}
\]

that “all clauses contain a topic position, Spec(IP), which is filled at s-structure by either the subject or a non-subject constituent.” (p. 46) It means that Spec(IP), even in subordinate clauses, must be filled by a topic element whether it is the subject or a non-subject constituent. The same kind of reference to the problem can be found in van Kemenade (1997: 338–340) and Fischer et al. (2001: 121).
However, more adequate explanations are necessary for the following reasons.

The first problem is optionality of the direction of cliticization. P proposes that pronominal and adverbial clitics can attach to either the left or the right periphery of Spec(IP) as shown in (32) and (33):

(32) IP-initially:
\[
& ic \text{ gehwam \ wille } \text{ ðæerto } \text{ taecan} \\
\text{and } I \text{ everyone will thereto direct} \\
\text{‘And I will direct everyone there …’} \\
\text{(Or 57.15/p. 171)}
\]

(33) Immediately after the topic:
\[
\text{hiora untrymnesse } he \text{ sceal orowian on his heortan} \\
\text{their weakness } he \text{ shall atone in his heart} \\
\text{‘He shall atone in his heart for their weakness …’} \\
\text{(CP 60.17/p. 171)}
\]

But P does not provide a systematic explanation for the optionality. Moreover, she argues that pronouns are frequently phonological enclitics, which must attach leftward at PF to the preceding word, as shown in (34).

(34) a. \text{pa } \text{ mec } sae } \text{ oþbær} \\
\text{then me } \text{ sea carried-away} \\
\text{‘Then the sea carried me away …’} \\
\text{(Beo 579/p. 163)}

b. \text{[IP mec } \text{ i } \text{ pa } \text{ j sae } \text{ k [I’ } \text{ tk } \text{ t } \text{ i } \text{ j oþbær]}} \\
\text{(p. 163)}

In (34a), P assumes that \text{sae} is the topic and both \text{pa} and \text{mec} are syntactic clitics and \text{mec} is also a phonological enclitic. Then she applies the local PF rule to invert \text{pa} and \text{mec} as indicated by the arrows in (34b) since there is no constituent to the left of \text{mec} at s-structure. As a result, \text{mec} can encliticize to \text{pa}. Thus the surface word order \text{pa mec} is different from the word order at s-structure \text{mec pa}. However, P does not assume such a phonological enclitic in (35).

(35) a. \text{him } \text{ pa } \text{ ellenrof} \text{ andswarode} \\
\text{him then brave-one answered} \\
\text{‘The brave one then answered him …’} \\
\text{(Beo 340/p. 163)}

b. \text{[IP him } \text{ i } \text{ pa } \text{ j ellenrofk } \text{ [I’ } \text{ tk } \text{ t } \text{ i } \text{ j answarode]}}

Such optionality entails the risk of arbitrariness.

Second, P insists that some adverbs in Old English are syntactic clitics as shown in (36) and (37):
(36) \[\text{[IP mid ŋy } ða [I' ongonₐ [VP firenlust weaxan ti]]}\]
   with that then began riotous-living increase
   ‘With that, riotous living then began to increase.’
   (Bede 48.27/p. 145)

(37) \[\text{[CP [C'} gai [IP nu to setleₐ [VP tj t]t]}\]
   go now to seat
   ‘Go now to your seat ...’
   (Beo 1782/p. 159)

However, the same adverbs can occupy \text{Spec(CP)} as non clitics as in (38) and (39):

(38) \[\text{[CP paₐ [C'} ge-metteₐ [IP heₜ sceadₐnₐ [I' [VP tₐ t m t j t] t]t]}\]
   then met he robbers
   ‘... then he met robbers ...’
   (ÆLS 31.151/p. 92)

(39) \[\text{[CP nu [C'} [IP we [I' sculònₐ [VP eft t ... now we must again ...]}\]
   ‘Now we must again ...’
   (Or 49.10/p. 94)

In addition, we have to struggle with ambiguity of \text{nu} in the following examples.

(40) \text{nu ic sceall sweltan}
    now I shall die
    ‘Now I shall die ...’
    (GD(C) 28.30–31/p. 184)

a. clitic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{IP} & \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{I'}
\quad \text{Spec} & \quad \text{I} \quad \text{VP}
\quad \text{nu} & \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{ic} \quad \text{sceall} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{sweltan} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{t}
\end{align*}
\]

b. topic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{IP} & \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{I'}
\quad \text{Spec} & \quad \text{ic} \quad \text{I} \quad \text{VP}
\quad \text{nu} & \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{sceall} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{sweltan} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{t}
\end{align*}
\]

P claims that in (40) either \text{ic} is the topic, with \text{nu} cliticized to the left periphery of \text{Spec(IP)}, as shown in (40a), or \text{nu} is the topic, with \text{ic} cliticized to the right periphery of \text{Spec(IP)}, as shown in (40b). Then
she examines the distribution of both pronouns and adverbs in her database and argues that pronouns favor the position after adverbs and adverbal clitics favor IP-initial positions. Thus she concludes that in most of such sentences, the adverbs are topics and the pronouns are clitics. However, as we see in (39), if nu occupies Spec(CP), it might be interpreted as a topic. Thus P’s argument about the relative sequence of adverbs and pronouns is not entirely convincing.

Moreover, Koopman (1996: 240) states, on the basis of his comprehensive description of the distribution of some adverbs, that very few are actually clitics on the grounds that the distribution of adverbs is not the same as the distribution of pronominal objects. This counters P’s claim that some adverbs can be clitics exactly like pronominal objects. Therefore, the assumption that some adverbs are syntactic clitics may complicate her explanation.

3.5. Motivation of Word Order Change

In this final subsection, I would like to discuss P’s argument that, over time, the frequency of Head-medial phrase structure (INFL-medial and VO) increased at the expense of Head-final phrase structure (INFL-final and OV). In the last chapter of the book under review, P discusses Middle English Change, but, as I have already mentioned, she presents her argument, which lacks empirical evidence, as a topic for future study. She provides not even a hint of motivation for that change.

Under the standard theory, it is assumed that the basic structure of Old English is V-final, as explained above. Then, during the course of the Middle English period, the head parameter abruptly changed to head-initial. Lightfoot and van Kemenade analyze this as a resetting of the parameter, specifying the direction of theta-role assignment from leftward to rightward. Van Kemenade suggests that the trigger was the high frequency of right-branching surface structures in all clause types, and Lightfoot claims that the trigger was the high frequency of post-verbal objects in main clauses. P herself gives no explanation for the trigger of the change.

Moreover, P concedes that she has no real explanation for the higher frequency of INFL-medial structure in main clauses as compared to subordinate clauses. However, the difference seems to be more significant than she assumes. It can be considered that the change of the head parameter began first in main clauses and then generalized to sub-
ordinate clauses. Therefore it is natural to assume the influence of the structure of CP, which is consistently Head-initial. If this assumption is on the right track, it is unnecessary to assume that the frequency of INFL-medial structures will increase at the same rate in main clauses as in subordinate clauses. Rather, it is natural to assume that the change, which started in main clauses, would affect the word order in subordinate clauses at a later date. Therefore, a differing rate of change between main and subordinate clauses is more plausible than a constant rate in this case.

4. Recent Development and Concluding Remarks

4.1. Pintzuk vs. van Kemenade

Nearly a decade has passed since P's original dissertation, which treats van Kemenade (1987) as central, was written. In the meantime, syntactic theory has advanced with the wide acceptance of the Minimalist Program by Chomsky (1995). Furthermore, we have also acquired more knowledge of the syntax of Old English with recent studies such as Hulk and van Kemenade (1997) and van Kemenade (1997). Nevertheless, P's approach is still influential to the diachronic study of English syntax. In this section I would like to review the recent development of van Kemenade's approach and compare it with Pintzuk's.

First, we must account for asymmetry with respect to the position of the pronominal subject between topic-initial sentences and operator-initial sentences, as in (41):

(41) a. topic-initial
Be ðæm we magon swiðe swutule oncnawan ðæt ...
by that we may very clearly perceive that
‘By that, we may very clearly perceive that . . .’
(CP.181.16/van Kemenade (1997: 339))

b. operator-initial
for hwam noldest þu ðe sylfe me gecyðan
for what not-wanted you yourself me make known
‘wherefore would you not make yourself known to me’
(ÆSL. XXXIII. 307/van Kemenade (1997: 339))

Van Kemenade (1987) analyses this as a process of cliticization of the pronominal subject to V/I, while P regards it as a difference between V-to-INFL and V-to-COMP movement in Old English. In the framework proposed by Hulk and van Kemenade (1997), this asymmetry is
explained on the basis of a more articulated structure as in the following:

\[(42)\]

\[
\text{CP} \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{C'} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{FP} \quad \text{Vf} \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{F'} \quad \text{pronoun} \quad \text{F} \quad \text{NegP} \quad \text{Vf} \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{Neg'} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{Neg} \quad \text{ne-Vf} \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{T'} \quad \text{Subject} \quad \text{T} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{V'} \quad \ldots \quad \text{V} \ldots
\]

They account for the asymmetry as follows:

\[(43)\]

a. Operator (WH, ne, pa) — Vf — Pronominal Subj.
b. Topic — Pronominal Subj. — Vf

If the first constituent is an operator, as in (43a), it is in Spec(CP) and Vf moves to C; and if the subject is a pronoun, it is in Spec(FP). On the other hand, if the first constituent is a topic, it is in Spec(CP), but does not draw Vf to C. Rather, Vf moves to the head position of FP, where it is preceded by the pronominal subject (in Spec(FP)), as in (43b). One of the advantage of this analysis over P’s is that we do not have to be worried about the optionality of the direction of cliticization. Pronouns have a position of their own, and their position relative to Vf is determined by the movement requirements on Vf: to C with operators and to F with topics. Another advantage of this analysis is that operators and topics can occupy the same position of the structure (Spec(CP)), and then we can avoid P’s problematic prediction that V2 with topicalization occurs in subordinate clauses as well as in
main clauses.

However, Hulk and van Kemenade's analysis also has some problems. The first is that they give no real explanation for the reason of the difference between Vf-to-C movement in interrogative or negative-initial contexts and Vf-to-F movement in topic-initial contexts. Secondly, it is true that this assumption also solves the following asymmetry between a nominal subject and a pronominal subject in topic-initial contexts.

(44)  a. Topic—Vf—Nominal Subj.
     b. Topic—Pronominal Subj.—Vf

Nevertheless, as is much argued in Koopman (1998), we can find a rather large number of examples which represent the configuration Topic—Nominal Subj.—Vf in Old English, as found in (45).

(45)  Be ðam Paulus cueð
       'about this Paul said'  (CP 97.11/Koopman (1998: 145))

More extensive inquiry into the above problem is required.

4.2. Concluding Remarks

Let me now reiterate some of the advantages and disadvantages of P's account. First, the double base hypothesis, which predicts that V-movement is symmetric between verb-medial main clauses and subordinate clauses, gives a clear explanation of some of the typical word order patterns in Old English, as in (46) and (47).

(46)  [IP ðæt husj [I hæfdoni] Romane tj to ðæm anum tacne
       that building had Romans with the one feature
geworht tj]
       constructed
       'The Romans had constructed that building with this one
feature ...'  (Or 59.3/p. 125)

(47)  æfter þæm þe [IP Lacedemonie [I hæfdoni] tj Perse
       after Lacedaemonians had Persians
       oft oferwynnen tj]
       often overcome
       'After the Lacedaemonians had often overcome the Persians'
       (Or 53.10–11/p. 146)

Without the need for postulating postposition, verb raising or verb projection raising as explained in 2.1, medial-INFL phrase structure can give a simpler account of such word orders than the standard theory. Similarly, the patterns with V-fronting in subordinate clauses can be
viewed as instances of the INFL-medial option. However, some critical remarks are also in order.

First, P presents a considerable number of ambiguous examples, but her probabilistic approach, in which she predicts the most probable option among ambiguous cases, is not persuasive, as explained in section 3. The second problem has to do with the optionality of the direction of head parameters. We need a better account of conflicting parameters: INFL-medial and OV at the sentence level, and INFL-final and INFL-medial, OV and VO, at the language level. The third issue is that P assumes only topic elements in Spec(IP). Restricting the position of topic elements to Spec(IP) enables V-fronting with topicalization in subordinate clauses, which is an unfavorable prediction. The fourth question is how clitics are dealt with: specifically, the direction of cliticization, the possibility of adverbial clitics and the ambiguity of clitic and topic. These phenomena related to cliticization remain unresolved under P’s assumption. Finally, P does not provide an adequate explanation for what triggered word order changes in the later history of English. Indeed, an explanation for word order change in Middle English may be beyond the scope of her argument. However, insofar as P argues for competing grammars within the same language, her argument would carry more weight if she could account for the eventual predomination of one grammar over the other.

With these critical comments, however, I do not wish to detract from the value of P’s observations on word order variation in Old English. Rather, I think highly of her approach for the following three reasons. First, P exemplifies the variation of word order found in Old English and then argues that the change of word order must be gradual, denying the abrupt reanalysis of underlying structure in Old English. The obvious gradualness and variation P presents in this book are worth accounting for, even if her double base hypothesis is not sufficient. Second, P attests the existence of V-movement in subordinate clauses on the basis of the distribution of particles. Then it makes us assume a landing site of a verb on the left side of VP in a subordinate clause as P represents with her evidence. Apart from Spec(IP) as a topic position, there is a good possibility that IP could be head-initial in a subordinate clause at that time. Finally, P fights resolutely against ambiguity and optionality in diachronic studies, which are a persistent challenge for any theoretical approach that aims at generalization. Even though her attempt is not fully satisfactory, her assumption of
competing grammars in Old English is still a promising solution of the problems of ambiguity and optionality found in the historical data.
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